

Date: Thu, 18 Nov 93 04:30:14 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #462  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 18 Nov 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 462

Today's Topics:

                    THE argument for CW requirements  
    THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas  
                    Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?  
    Yet Another License Structure Proposal... (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Mon, 15 Nov 93 02:54:58 EST  
From: munnari.oz.au!spool.mu.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!  
wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: THE argument for CW requirements  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:  
[bunches deleted]  
> >Since SS \*has\* become a consumer technology,  
> >the costs of setting up a SS system have plummeted, and are likely to  
> >drop even further as cellular changes over to SS, and wireless lan  
> >products continue to proliferate.  
>  
> Okay, so when can I buy one? Not now? Fine. Then I \*might\* consider spendi  
> the money and changing the rules when I can, \*and\* when you've shown a  
> unique benefit. Until then the change you've proposed isn't warrented.  
>

> Given that the commercial systems aren't designed for HF characteristics, you  
> yourself have just created a strawman (albeit with no legs).

Paul, arn't we acting a bit too "appliance operatorish" here? :-)

```
=====
|| Dan Pickersgill N8PKV || "What a wonderful world it is that ||
|| dan@mystis.wariat.org || has girls in it!" -L. Long ||
=====
|| 'Pots have handles, Magazines have Personals, Hams have Names' ||
=====
```

-----

Date: Sun, 14 Nov 93 14:06:33 EST  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!yeshua.marcam.com!  
zip.eecs.umich.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@athena.mit.edu (David R Tucker) writes:

> In article <Xgiycc2w165w@mystis.wariat.org> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Picker  
>  
> If CW is truly valuable and a asset, people will learn it BECAUSE it is  
> valuable. If it isn't, let it die in peace the death it deserves. Don't  
> try to keep it alive by artificial means.  
>  
> If you wrote this, you must have misinterpreted what I wrote. I  
> specifically argued that people might, to the detriment of all, decide  
> as individuals not to learn the code. People might not learn it  
> DESPITE its value if everyone does. It may not deserve the death you  
> are so anxious to give it.

I did NOT say it deserves death. I said IF it can not stand WITHOUT  
testing, it WILL die the death [it then] deserves.

>  
> However, I would venture to say that, in the last 15 years, FM Voice  
> has had a much greater effect on the "public-good" than CW and we don't  
> test for that mode!  
>  
> Packet Radio meets your definition of "public-good" as it saves  
> bandwidth. (Albiet not a real time mode.) It transmits data quickly in  
> chunks, is brief in transmission therefor and has the ability to allow  
> multiple users to share the same frequency. Yet no test for that.  
>

> Test? How? Can you pass a packet test by ear - at any speed?  
> Another bogus analogy. How the hell do you "test" for FM reception?  
> It makes no sense.

Different modes require different equipment. I could, given a little time, come up with a valid test for both packet and FM voice that would if tested across the board improve operations and spectrum conservation. The latter being important to the Pro-Code-Testing group.

Now from your last paragraph, since one requires a reciever/tnc/modem for packet reception and you said "...a packet test by ear..." then can I safely assume that you get CW signals in your brain directly with out any type of reciever? Or are you argueing that CW can use equipment to recieve but not packet? And FM voice (IF you DO use a reciever) becomes very analogous(sp) to CW.

```
=====
|| Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV    ||  "What a wonderful world it is that ||
|| dan@mystis.wariat.org    ||    has girls in it!" -L. Long      ||
=====
||  'Pots have handles, Magazines have Personals, Hams have Names'  ||
=====
```

-----

Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1993 19:35:43 GMT  
From: olivea!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewsm!jeffj@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

With all the ranting and raving about Nocodes and what not here's food for thought. What exactly has kept Amateur Radio from turning into CB? Is it the written tests? The code tests? The self regulation? There must be something. I believe it's the combination of the code and the written tests. To pass both takes a fair amount of effort and those that are the real bane of CB don't have enough on the ball to study for the tests. CW has worked as a fairly good filter like it or not. So has the written tests. However the days of CW tests are coming to a close and it will be gone in the future. The written tests will be made easier and easier so perhaps the lines between CB and Amateur Radio will blurr. Any comments?

Jeff

--

```
Jeff Jones  AB6MB          | OPPOSE THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT!
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com    | This Extra supports CW and the Nocode license!
Infolinc BBS 510-778-5929  |
```

-----  
Date: Mon, 15 Nov 93 02:57:21 EST  
From: munnari.oz.au!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!  
dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Yet Another License Structure Proposal...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jws@fc.hp.com (John Schmidt) writes:

>  
> In Europe, countries are standardizing license classes so that automatic  
> reciprocity is possible (the CEPT classifications).  
>  
> If the US were to change class structures again, I'd vote for something that  
> would be in line with the CEPT classes to make arranging for reciprocal  
> licenses easy, if not automatic.  
>  
> I'm not 100% sure, but I believe that this would be satisfied by the  
> following structure:  
>  
> Class B: All VHF/UHF amateur allocations  
>   No code  
>   Written exam same as current Technician (elements 2 & 3a)  
>  
>  
> Class A: All amateur allocations  
>   5 or 10 wpm code (until requirement is dropped by ITU)  
>   Written exam same as current General (or possibly including  
>   some of element 4a (Advanced)).  
>  
> Why make it any more complicated or difficult than it needs to be? The U.S.  
> has the most complex license structure in the world, and it hasn't done  
> us any particular good. If it does change someday, let's follow the  
> KISS principle (not to mention the lead of most of the rest of the  
> world).

I include all of John's post because I feel he has a very good idea.  
Since a lot of us have discussed changing license structure, as he said,  
then this is definitely something to consider and discuss.

As for the CW requirement in class A, any objections to splitting the  
difference and calling it 7 WPM?   :-)

You could add a Class A+ for VE's (current extra written, modified).

```
=====
|| Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV    ||   "What a wonderful world it is that ||
|| dan@mystis.wariat.org    ||   has girls in it!" -L. Long      ||
=====
|| 'Pots have handles, Magazines have Personals, Hams have Names' ||
=====
```

-----

Date: Mon, 15 Nov 1993 14:38:23  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!lard.ftp.com!tiedye.wco.ftp.com!  
andy@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Yet Another License Structure Proposal...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Nov12.234111.5384@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu  
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

This has good points and bad points:

The good point is the elimination of the 20 wpm test for Extra.

>Grandfathering:

>-----

>Novice, Technician => Class C

>General, Advanced => Class B

>Extra => Class A

>Privileges:

>-----

>Class A:           All amateur allocations and modes, Volunteer Examiner.

>Class B:           All amateur allocations and modes above 28 MHz.

>           All amateur modes on the following allocations:

>                   75% of all HF wideband allocations.

>                   50% of all HF narrowband allocations.

>Class C:           All amateur allocations and modes above 28 MHz.

>           Narrowband modes on the following allocations:

>                   50% of the HF narrowband allocations on

>                   the 80, 40, and 15m bands.

This would be a downgrade of privileges for current General and Advanced class  
licenseholders, in that they would lose a big chunk of each narrowband HF  
segment that they currently have. It would also introduce Extra-Class  
subbands where they currently do not exist (160 and WARC bands),  
so it is a loss of wideband privileges as well.

Since the narrowband segments are themselves split between CW and other digital modes, the additional Extra class subbands would have to be chosen with care so as to not lock everyone else out of either the CW portion or the RTTY/Packet/AMTOR portion.

>Exam Elements:

>-----

>C0: Written exam on operating practices for narrowband modes.

>C1: 5 WPM Morse Code Exam, one minute out of five 90% correct.

>C2: 13 WPM Morse Code Exam, one minute out of five 90% correct.

And this part would prevent me from upgrading, since burst-mode copy is all I can do. The old solid-copy exams kept me out of ham radio for over 15 years.

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #462

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*